

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,179	10/16/2003	Robert E. Williams JR.	7348 ·	9546
75	90 10/27/2006		EXAM	INER
Paul M. Denk Patent Law Office, L.C.			SILBERMANN, JOANNE	
Ste. 170 763 S. New Bal	las		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
St. Louis, MO	63141	·	3611	

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		10/688,179	WILLIAMS, ROBERT E.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Joanne Silbermann	3611	
7 Period for F	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHOR WHICHE - Extensio after SIX - If NO per - Failure tc Any reply	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Description of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. From the mailing date of this communication period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statuty received by the Office later than three months after the mailing latent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
2a)∏ Th 3)∏ Si	esponsive to communication(s) filed on <u>17 Johns action is FINAL. 2b) This nee this application is in condition for allowables accordance with the practice under a</u>	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition	of Claims			
4a 5)☐ CI 6)⊠ CI 7)⊠ CI	laim(s) 1-4 and 9-14 is/are pending in the ap) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawing is/are allowed. laim(s) 1-4,9,10,12-14 is/are rejected. laim(s) 11 is/are objected to. laim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	awn from consideration.		
Application	Papers			
10)□ Th Ap Re	e specification is objected to by the Examinate drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the eplacement drawing sheet(s) including the corrected of the epith or declaration is objected to by the Examinate specific properties.	cepted or b) objected to by the lead rawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is objection is	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority und	der 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
) If References Cited (PTO-892) If Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate	
3) Informat	tion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) o(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application	

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 2. Claims 1, 10 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 3. In claim 1 line 4 "a series of tags" is indefinite. It is not clear if these tags are the same as the "tags" in line 1.
- 4. In claim 10 line 2 "the base of the tag" does not have antecedent basis.
- 5. In claim 14 line 19 "the base" does not have antecedent basis.

Claim Objections

6. Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line 11 "adhere" should be "adhered". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/688,179

Art Unit: 3611

8. Claims 1-4, 9, 10 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niedecker, US 5,300,344 in view of Kaufmann, US #5,264,265.

Page 3

- 9. Niedecker teaches a series of separable tags (Figure 1) for containers (Figure 2). The tags have a bottom portion 8 and integral neck 4 extending upwardly therefrom.

 Neck 4 is substantially narrower than the bottom portion and extends upward from the bottom portion approximately centrally therefrom.
- 10. Niedecker does not teach an upper layer on the tag, however such multi-layer tags are well known in the art, as shown by Kaufmann. Kaufmann teaches tag 13 including upper layer 2 overlying the entire tag (Figure 1). The upper layer is separable between the bottom and upper portions and is adhered to (and peelable from) the bottom layer by adhesive 11. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to utilize such an upper layer on the tag of Niedecker to provide an area for extended text and graphics, as taught by Kaufmann (see Abstract).
- 11. The tag of Niedecker may be made of paper or printable plastic (column 2 lines21).
- 12. The upper layer (as in Kaufmann) is synthetic printable material and is capable of being imprinted.
- 13. Adhesive 11 (Kaufmann) s a release type adhesive.
- 14. Niedecker does not specifically teach perforations separating the tags, however this is well known in the art. Niedecker teaches the tags as being separable. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to utilize perforations as a

means for severing since perforations are old and well known and would provide a means for severing the tags that does not require a tool (such as scissors).

15. Regarding claim 14, the tags of Niedecker may be used to form a roll.

Allowable Subject Matter

16. Claim 11 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

17. Applicant's arguments, filed July 17, 2006, with respect to the rejection(s) of the claim(s) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Niedecker and Kaufmann, as above.

Conclusion

18. In view of the appeal brief filed on 17 July 2006, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

Application/Control Number: 10/688,179

Art Unit: 3611

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant

must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by

signing below:

LESLEY D. MORRIS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Page 5

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joanne Silbermann whose telephone number is 571-272-6653. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 5:30 - 2:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lesley Morris can be reached on 571-272-6651. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/688,179

Art Unit: 3611

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Joanne Silbermann Primary Examiner Art Unit 3611 Page 6

js 24 October 2006